

REMARKS

The last Office Action of April 14, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-5 remain in the application.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto (US 5,754,531).

Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 2, now canceled, and by better encompassing the full scope and breadth of the invention. Claims 3 to 5 have been amended to make cosmetic changes and to provide proper antecedent basis for all term used.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, *inter alia*, that the parameter number and the parameter value are separately stored at the memory address, that the separately stored parameter number and parameter value are returned to the data input device, that the returned stored parameter number and parameter value are compared at the data input device with the corresponding transmitted parameter number and parameter value of the inputted dataset, and that the received dataset is released if the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value are identical to the corresponding ones of the inputted dataset.

As disclosed in paragraph [0021] of the instant application:

"conventional methods for parameterization cannot reliably indicate if the provided parameter values have actually been read into the parameter memory 18 of the apparatuses 2 and 4, respectively. Possible errors can therefore only be recognized based on the operation of the apparatuses 2 and 4, respectively."

As further described in paragraph [0024]:

"These errors can be identified according to another advantageous embodiment of the method of the invention by including

additional methods steps, whereby not only the received dataset is acknowledged, but also the read-in parameter value. The memory address is hereby determined from the parameter number, or from the parameter number and parameter index, which are stored at pre-defined locations 30 or 32 in the parameter memory 18, and the parameter value stored therein is read out. The parameter number, the read-out parameter value and the parameter index again form a dataset which is acknowledged upon receipt. In the identity check, this received acknowledged combined dataset is compared with the inputted dataset. If the identity is confirmed, the read-in parameter value is released. Accordingly, this advantageous embodiment of the method checks the parameterization between the data input device and a read-in parameter value."

Since the apparatus uses the stored parameter values for its operation, Applicants realized that it is not only essential to compare the accuracy of the received data, but the accuracy of the data actually stored in a permanent memory, i.e., the parameter memory 18. In addition, the various field of the transmitted dataset are compared separately, which adds additional safety in diagnosing errors.

Although the Examiner asserts with reference to claim 2, by referring to column 15, lines 45-55, of the '531 patent, that Okamoto teaches "combining the dataset of a received parameter to be acknowledged from its stored parameter number and the parameter value stored at the determined memory address," Okamoto discloses only a reception buffer aiding in the data conversion, but not a (permanent) parameter memory 18.

Okamoto therefore fails to disclose an essential limitation of amended claim 1, so that claim 1 is patentable over Okamoto.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: July 5, 2006
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:WS:ub